

1  
2  
3 PUBLIC HEARING  
4 ACCEPTING COMMENTS REGARDING  
5 MISSOURI RIVER REVISED DRAFT ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT STATEMENT  
6 MASTER WATER CONTROL MANUAL

7 PROCEEDINGS HELD AT:

8 Ramkota Convention Center  
9 920 West Sioux Avenue  
10 Pierre, South Dakota 57501

11 Monday, October 29, 2001  
12 7:00 o'clock p.m.  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22

23 Reported by Carla A. Bachand, RMR, Capital Reporting  
24 Services, P.O. Box 903, Pierre, South Dakota 57501 (605)  
25 224-7611.

CAPITAL REPORTING SERVICES

1 MONDAY, OCTOBER 29, 2001

2 (Colonel David Fastabend gave a short welcome and  
3 opening statement, followed by the showing of a video.)

4 COLONEL DAVID FASTABEND: I will call the names of  
5 those who have submitted cards, beginning with the elected  
6 officials. We will first hear from Ms. Jackie Stocklin from  
7 Senator Daschle's office.

8 JACKIE STOCKLIN: I do have a statement if you would  
9 like the copy afterwards.

10 COLONEL DAVID FASTABEND: We need to check your  
11 microphone there, Jackie.

12 JACKIE STOCKLIN: I am Jackie Stocklin from Senator  
13 Daschle's office, Rapid City, South Dakota.

14 COLONEL DAVID FASTABEND: Hold up a second. You  
15 having trouble in the back? Can we get some help up here on  
16 the mike? Anybody know how to control the volume?

17 JACKIE STOCKLIN: We will go from here. Again, I am  
18 from Senator Daschle's office and this is his statement.  
19 Thank you for providing me with this opportunity to testify  
20 about South Dakota's priorities for the revision of the  
21 Missouri River Master Water Control Manual. I appreciate all  
22 of you coming to Pierre today and I wish I could have joined  
23 you in person to discuss this matter with you.

24 Twelve years ago the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers  
25 started the process of revising the Missouri River Master

1 Manual. This effort was long overdue. And while I am pleased  
2 that the Corps took on this issue, the review process has  
3 dragged on far too long. It is my firm hope that this hearing  
4 will bring us closer to its completion and to a meaningful  
5 revision of the river's management plan.

6 The current Master Manual was written decades ago. It  
7 is outdated. It does not provide for enough water to support  
8 recreation. It is not sensitive to the needs of fish and  
9 wildlife. Instead it supports a small downstream barge  
10 industry at the cost of undermining the other major values of  
11 the river.

12 When the dams were constructed decades ago, we lacked  
13 a full understanding of their broad impact. We knew they  
14 would benefit the economy, but we didn't understand that their  
15 main benefit, aside from flood control, would be from  
16 recreation.

17 Today, hunting, camping, fishing, boating and other  
18 forms of recreation are an \$85 million industry. They support  
19 thousands of jobs and provide thousands more families with a  
20 way to enjoy themselves together.

21 Despite economic impact of the recreation industry,  
22 the Master Manual calls for the Corps to release water from  
23 the dams during the peak summer months of recreation to  
24 support the downstream barge industry. Releasing this water  
25 leaves South Dakota's boat docks high and dry and takes a

1 heavy toll on South Dakota's economy.

2           It would be one thing if water were sent downstream to  
3 meet a compelling national need. However, the truth is that  
4 water is released from the dams because the economists who  
5 helped to write the Master Manual in the 1960s got it wrong.  
6 They vastly overestimated the number of barges that would use  
7 the river.

8           Today's barge industry is valued at only \$7 million.  
9 It is so small that it carries only a tiny fraction of our  
10 regional agricultural products and has absolutely no  
11 competitive effect on rail rates. Yet this small industry  
12 exercises a lot of political clout. Barge operators know that  
13 they are getting the deal of a lifetime and will do whatever  
14 they can to keep the Master Manual from being changed. It is  
15 time for the Corps to stand up to the barge industry and  
16 restore fairness to the management of the Missouri.

17           The second major issue that needs to be addressed is  
18 the effect that dams have had on fish and wildlife. Because  
19 of the unnatural way in which water is released from the dams,  
20 three species have been brought to the brink of extinction.  
21 Unless the Corps changes the way it manages the river, the  
22 Corps of Engineers could be found in violation of the  
23 Endangered Species Act and the courts could intervene in river  
24 management. If that happens, it would be virtually impossible  
25 for the public to have any direct input into the river

1 management.

2           Fortunately, these two problems can both be remedied  
3 if the Corps modernizes the Master Manual and incorporates a  
4 spring rise and split season in its management plan.  
5 According to the Fish and Wildlife Service, the spring rise  
6 will better mimic the natural flow of the river and help  
7 restore fish and wildlife to health. In addition, the split  
8 season plan will retain more water behind the dams in summer  
9 months when it is needed for recreation, while releasing water  
10 in the spring and fall to meet the needs of the barge industry  
11 during its time of heaviest use.

12           I strongly support both the spring rise and split  
13 season. These proposals will modernize the management of the  
14 river to meet today's needs and uses. And they will benefit  
15 South Dakota by improving hunting and fishing and  
16 strengthening our economy.

17           Finally, the Corps needs to understand that there is a  
18 consequence to inaction. Unless the Corps sticks to its  
19 current schedule and modernizes river management by 2003, a  
20 lawsuit could open the way for courts to manage the river.  
21 For that reason, I asked for and received assurances from both  
22 Secretary of the Army Tom White and Assistant Secretary of  
23 Civil Works Mike Parker that the Corps will release a  
24 recommendation for a river management plan by next May. It is  
25 important for the Corps to keep this pledge. It already has

1 taken 12 years to revise the Master Manual. No further delay  
2 is acceptable.

3 These two officials also pledged that the Corps will  
4 follow the law during this process. Since the Corps must  
5 adopt a spring rise in order to comply with the Endangered  
6 Species Act, I see no legal way for the Corps to adopt  
7 anything other than that plan.

8 The Missouri River is at a crossroads. For the first  
9 time in decades, we are growing closer to adopting a new  
10 management plan for the Missouri. I urge the Corps to choose  
11 a management plan that will more fairly distribute the river's  
12 economic benefits and restore its fish and wildlife to  
13 health.

14 Thank you for providing me with this opportunity to  
15 testify. I look forward to our continued work together.

16 COLONEL DAVID FASTABEND: Thank you, Ms. Stocklin.  
17 Mr. Pirner.

18 STEVE PIRNER: Colonel, thank you. I can speak loud  
19 enough, I think. My name is Steve Pirner, I am the Secretary  
20 of the South Dakota Department of Environment and Natural  
21 Resources. I would like to read a joint statement that was  
22 prepared by both the Department of Environment and Natural  
23 Resources and by the South Dakota Department of Game, Fish and  
24 Parks. I would also like the record to show that Secretary  
25 Cooper is also present this evening from the South Dakota

1 Department of Game, Fish and Parks.

2           Thank you for the opportunity to provide comments on  
3 the Revised Draft Environmental Impact Statement for the  
4 Missouri River Master Water Control Manual. This subject is  
5 not new to the Corps, the South Dakota Department of  
6 Environment and Natural Resources, which I will refer to as  
7 DENR, or the Department of Game, Fish and Parks. For the past  
8 12 years, the Corps has been engaged in a process to change  
9 the management of the Missouri River. Publication of the  
10 Revised Draft Environmental Impact Statement by the Corps  
11 which contains six different alternatives is a huge step  
12 forward, but this is no time to rest. It is time to study the  
13 alternatives, make the final decisions, and move forward with  
14 implementing a new Master Manual that works for the river.

15           Officials of the Corps have said the final decision or  
16 alternative must meet all three of the following objectives:  
17 Number one, it must serve congressionally authorized project  
18 purposes. Number two, it must serve the contemporary needs of  
19 the basin. And number three, it must comply with all  
20 applicable laws to include the federal Threatened and  
21 Endangered Species Act.

22           Game, Fish and Parks and DENR agree with using these  
23 three criteria to make the final alternative and decision. We  
24 believe that approach will result in the best plan for the  
25 entire Missouri River basin.

1           The Corps included the current Water Control Plan as  
2 one of the six alternatives in the Revised Draft Environmental  
3 Impact Statement. Using the three criteria just listed, it is  
4 clear the current 40-year-old Master Manual cannot be the  
5 final alternative. When the mainstem dams were built, the  
6 vision for the river was one of flood control, hydropower,  
7 navigation, and irrigation. While flood control and  
8 hydropower followed the vision and have been very successful,  
9 irrigation and navigation have not. Less than 10 percent of  
10 the land authorized for irrigation under the Flood Control Act  
11 of 1944 is irrigated today. Only slightly more than 10  
12 percent of the annual commercial navigation anticipated under  
13 the Flood Control Act of 1944 takes place today, and the Corps  
14 estimates it to be a \$7 million industry.

15           Clearly the contemporary uses of the Missouri River no  
16 longer reflect these 40-year-old visions. Instead of using  
17 the river for large scale irrigation and navigation projects,  
18 people have found other uses for the river. Fishing, boating,  
19 and recreation uses have increased tenfold, and recreation is  
20 now an annual \$87 million industry in the basin. However, the  
21 current Master Manual drains the upper basin reservoirs during  
22 even moderately dry periods to maintain navigation flows  
23 downstream and leaves recreational users high and dry.  
24 Therefore, the contemporary uses of the river demand that  
25 changes are made to the Master Manual and keeping the current

1 Master Manual is simply not an acceptable option.

2           The remaining five alternatives in the Revised Draft  
3 Environmental Impact Statement share several proposed changes,  
4 all of which we strongly support, and I would like to talk  
5 about each of those proposed changes and make a few brief  
6 remarks. Number one, adaptive management. In a river whose  
7 watershed encompasses one-sixth of the continental United  
8 States, there will never be normal conditions. There will be  
9 constant changes in the weather patterns, runoff, and river  
10 uses. Consequently, giving the Corps the authority and the  
11 flexibility to address constantly changing conditions must be  
12 a component of the final decision. Having the Corps locked  
13 into the current inflexible Master Manual makes no sense,  
14 breeds hostility between the users of the river, and has  
15 driven certain species onto the federal Threatened and  
16 Endangered and Species list. Number.

17           Two, drought conservation measures. The current  
18 Master Manual does very little for water conservation.  
19 America has entered a new era. We are no longer a country  
20 with unlimited natural resources. Upper basin states know  
21 conservation measures are important because we have seen the  
22 consequences of river management with little or no  
23 conservation measures under the current Master Manual. Low  
24 water levels in upper basin reservoirs eliminate recreational  
25 uses, devastate local economies, and increase the risk of

1 having catastrophic drought impacts downstream. It is  
2 absolutely critical that drought conservation measures be part  
3 of the final decision.

4           Number three, unbalancing of the upper three  
5 reservoirs. Unbalancing the reservoirs will improve habitat  
6 conditions for nesting terns and plovers and trigger spawning  
7 for the pallid sturgeon. At the same time, unbalancing of the  
8 reservoirs provides benefits to other fisheries in these three  
9 lakes. South Dakota Department of Game, Fish and Parks and  
10 DENR support the concept of unbalancing and recommend it to be  
11 a component of the final decision.

12           Number four, flow modification of the Fort Peck  
13 reservoir. Construction of the mainstem reservoirs has had  
14 very negative impacts to several of the native river species.  
15 Flow modification from Fort Peck is a logical and reasonable  
16 approach to help restore these species. If these species  
17 can't be restored, the entire basin benefits by avoiding the  
18 potential court ordered management of the river through the  
19 Endangered Species Act. Game, Fish and Parks and DENR  
20 strongly support the concept of flow modifications from Fort  
21 Peck, when water availability makes it feasible.

22           Four of the alternatives listed in the Revised Draft  
23 Environmental Impact Statement share the following attribute,  
24 which Game, Fish and Parks and DENR also support:

25           Flow modifications from Gavins Point Dam, which we

1 also strongly support. As mentioned previously, construction  
2 of the mainstem reservoirs has had very negative impacts on  
3 several native river species. Flow modification from Fort  
4 Peck when water availability makes it feasible has been  
5 largely agreed upon as a way to help restore these species.  
6 However, proposed flow modifications from Gavins Point have  
7 been much more controversial. Game, Fish and Parks and DENR  
8 support flow modification from Gavins Point Dam for the same  
9 reasons as we support flow modifications from Fort Peck.

10 Of the four alternatives in the Revised Draft  
11 Environmental Impact Statement that contain flow modifications  
12 from Gavins Point, the Department of Game, Fish and Parks and  
13 DENR strongly support the Corps having the ability to  
14 implement the GP20/21 alternative through adaptive  
15 management. The science behind this alternative has gained  
16 nearly universal support from the technical fish and wildlife  
17 community and provides maximum recreational benefits for South  
18 Dakota. The Missouri River recreation is critical to South  
19 Dakota's economy and quality of life.

20 This concludes our comments and recommendations for  
21 the Revised Draft Environmental Impact Statement. Using the  
22 criteria established by the Corps for selecting the final  
23 alternative, Game, Fish and Parks and DENR are confident our  
24 recommendations will become the Corps's final decision. We  
25 look forward to working with the Corps and the other basin

1 states to implement the new Master Manual and maximize the  
2 beneficial uses and quality of life throughout the entire  
3 river basin.

4 Those comments again were signed by John Cooper,  
5 Secretary of the South Dakota Department of Game, Fish and  
6 Parks, and myself, Steve Pirner, Secretary of the Department  
7 of Environment and Natural Resources.

8 COLONEL DAVID FASTABEND: Thank you, Mr. Pirner. Mr.  
9 Gary Drewes, mayor of Pierre.

10 GARY DREWES: Thank you, and welcome to Pierre. I  
11 have no prepared remarks, Carla. I will keep my remarks short  
12 this evening. I am in my twelfth year serving as mayor of  
13 Pierre. We have three-year terms here. One of the first  
14 meetings that I ever attended after being elected mayor was  
15 talking about the Master Manual and the revisions of it. At  
16 the time I thought I would probably go through at least my  
17 first term as mayor and into my second term before we would  
18 receive some results from that. I am now at the point where I  
19 am going to be finishing my fourth term and I still don't  
20 think we are going to see any results actually implemented for  
21 the Master Manual. Twelve years definitely, as has been  
22 stated already before, is too long. I encourage you to move  
23 forward on this in the most expedient manner that you possibly  
24 can.

25 Initially going back, one of the reasons that this

1 particular area in South Dakota primarily was interested in  
2 the reservoir system and the dams was the prospects of  
3 irrigation. Those prospects never developed. Even after  
4 millions of dollars were spent, after lots of dirt was moved,  
5 equipment was installed, that project was scrapped and  
6 Congress even deauthorized the project itself. So the  
7 benefits of irrigation never came about. But one of the side  
8 benefits, as also has been mentioned, that probably wasn't  
9 recognized was how beneficial it would be for recreation.  
10 Recreation has proved very beneficial for this area, for a  
11 large area of the area where reservoirs are included. And I  
12 think it is time for a change and to recognize the value of  
13 that recreation to its full extent. I think we have  
14 accomplished a lot with the recreation, but at the same time I  
15 can see where in the future that recreation is jeopardized  
16 unless changes are made.

17 I recognize that the Corps of Engineers has many  
18 concerns with the endangered species, with wildlife issues,  
19 with the historic and cultural issues that come about.  
20 Recreation is another one, the barge interests in it, but at  
21 the same time I think that we have to weigh those in their  
22 entirety at this point and move forward and make the changes  
23 that are necessary. I couldn't agree more with the statement  
24 that was made by Senator Daschle relative to the impact, the  
25 economic impact that the barge industry has in comparison to

1 the recreation industry. Even with all the concerns that has  
2 been brought to the Corps of Engineers, and I know that during  
3 this 12 years you have had many new concerns that have been  
4 brought to you, but I think one of the concerns that's been  
5 not necessarily left out but has not been highlighted is  
6 concern of people and the future generations and what this  
7 reservoir system is going to mean to those future generations,  
8 and it won't mean a lot unless things are done in the near  
9 future.

10 I also have the privilege of serving as the chairman  
11 of a new organization called the Missouri Sedimentation Action  
12 Coalition, and just briefly to tell you that this is a group  
13 that's designed to assist in trying to clean up some of the  
14 sedimentation issues in the Missouri River, as we see  
15 sedimentation as something that's going to really be, have a  
16 large impact, negative impact on many of the things, the  
17 amenities that we receive from the river, not to mention the  
18 hydropower and the recreation. Our effort on that will be  
19 positive towards the Corps of Engineers. We do want to lobby  
20 and encourage Congress to give the responsibility of  
21 sedimentation, whether it's from the tributaries or whether  
22 it's from the shoreline, to the Corps of Engineers and at the  
23 same time we want to lobby to fund those programs, such as the  
24 Missouri River Restoration Act, to give you the money to take  
25 care of those needs in those particular areas. So we are

1 looking forward to continuing to work with the Corps of  
2 Engineers to resolve the issues not only on the Master Manual  
3 but on the sedimentation issues. I thank you for the  
4 opportunity of being here this evening.

5 COLONEL DAVID FASTABEND: Thank you, Mayor Drewes.

6 RICHARD MOORE: Nell McPhillips.

7 NELL MCPHILLIPS: Good evening. My name is Nell  
8 McPhillips. I am here this evening on behalf of the U.S. Fish  
9 and Wildlife Service to issue a brief statement on the Revised  
10 Draft Environmental Impact Statement for the Missouri River  
11 Master Water Control Manual. I'm also here to listen to the  
12 comments in person from citizens on this important issue.

13 The Service has primary authority for oversight of our  
14 nation's rarest animals under the Endangered Species Act. The  
15 Missouri River is home to the endangered pallid sturgeon and  
16 least tern, and the threatened piping plover. The decline of  
17 these species tells us that the river is not healthy for its  
18 native fish and wildlife, and that there needs to be a change  
19 in its management to restore the Missouri to a more naturally  
20 functioning river system. A healthy river provides wildlife  
21 habitat, supports fishing, and makes boating an attractive  
22 recreational activity.

23 Congress committed the federal government to  
24 preventing extinctions by requiring federal agencies to use  
25 their authorities to conserve endangered and threatened

1 species. During the last 12 years our agency has been working  
2 with the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers to modernize the  
3 management of the Missouri River to help stabilize and  
4 hopefully begin to increase and recover populations of these  
5 very rare animals. This new approach was described recently  
6 in a document called the Missouri River Biological Opinion,  
7 published in November 2000.

8           The biological opinion looks at the river as a system  
9 and outlines the status of these rare species, the effects of  
10 the current operation on them, and a reasonable and prudent  
11 alternative to the current operation that will not jeopardize  
12 their continued existence.

13           Our biological opinion is based on the best available  
14 science and includes nearly 500 scientific references. In  
15 addition, we have sought out six respected scientists, big  
16 river specialists, who confirmed the need to address flow  
17 management, as well as habitat restoration. Further, the  
18 Missouri River Natural Resources Committee, a group comprised  
19 of the state experts on Missouri River management, endorses  
20 the science in the opinion.

21           If you have read the RDEIS or the summary document,  
22 you understand that the GP alternatives encompass the range of  
23 flows identified by the Service as necessary below Gavins  
24 Point Dam to keep the listed species from being jeopardized.  
25 Our agency, and the Corps, also recognized the importance of

1 some flexibility in management that would enable Missouri  
2 River managers to capitalize on existing water conditions to  
3 meet endangered species objectives without having to go  
4 through another 12-year process.

5 Other management changes identified in the biological  
6 opinion include a spring rise out of Fort Peck Dam, an  
7 improved hatchery operation to assist declining pallid  
8 sturgeon populations, restoration of approximately 20 percent  
9 of the lost aquatic habitat in the lowest one-third of the  
10 river, intrasystem unbalancing of the three largest  
11 reservoirs, and acceptance of an adaptive management framework  
12 that would include improved overall monitoring of the river.

13 In closing, the Service supports the identified goal  
14 of the revised Master Manual, to manage the river to serve  
15 contemporary needs of the Missouri River basin and nation.  
16 These needs include taking steps to insure that threatened and  
17 endangered species are protected while maintaining many other  
18 socioeconomic benefits being provided by the operation of the  
19 Missouri River dams. The Service stands behind the science  
20 used in the opinion and is confident that the operational  
21 changes identified in our opinion and included in the RDEIS as  
22 GP alternatives will insure that these rare species continue  
23 to be a part of the Missouri River's living wildlife legacy.

24 The Missouri River is a tremendous river, with a  
25 significant and revered heritage. Our influence has altered

1 the river greatly. Changes are needed to modernize and  
2 restore health to the river, for the benefit of rare species  
3 and for people, too. Thank you.

4 COLONEL DAVID FASTABEND: Thank you, Ms. McPhillips.

5 RICHARD MOORE: Curt Hohn.

6 CURT HOHN: Thank you. My name is Curt Hohn from  
7 Aberdeen, South Dakota, and I am the manager, general manager  
8 of the WEB Pipeline project, a rural water system that  
9 provides drinking water to 17 counties in South Dakota and  
10 part of North Dakota. I have a written statement that I will  
11 submit after the testimony. I want to thank the Corps for  
12 holding this hearing and getting public comment.

13 Rural water, domestic water delivered to ranches and  
14 farms is a new benefit to the Missouri River system that was  
15 not envisioned in the 1940s. It was replaced, a replacement  
16 for the irrigation that was not accepted here in this part of  
17 the country and in turn we traded irrigation that we could not  
18 agree on for drinking water systems that we needed. I have a  
19 map that's attached to this testimony which shows the rural  
20 water systems that have developed in South Dakota. There are  
21 some 60 systems, and of that, there are some 11 that provide  
22 drinking water to South Dakota ranches, farms and towns from  
23 the Missouri River system. I will give you a copy to look at  
24 of that map and it will be submitted as part of the record.

25 The alternative that we would support is consistent

1 with the state's position, which is 2021. We think it's an  
2 alternative that offers the best overall advantage for the  
3 people of South Dakota and for all the multiple uses on the  
4 river, some of which have changed in the last 40 years and  
5 rural water is a part of it.

6 I am here today to talk for WEB and speak for WEB, but  
7 there are many rural water systems that have the same concerns  
8 about how the river is managed. The EIS talks about the fact  
9 that access to water is the most important concern for  
10 municipal water systems. Obviously a wet intake is essential  
11 for a water system. But we are also concerned about the  
12 quality of the water and how it's maintained. The  
13 fluctuations of the river can move as much as 23 to 38 foot in  
14 a given period of time or a given season, and those  
15 fluctuations affect water quality. Suspended solids,  
16 particles that are floating in the water that have to be  
17 treated and removed have an effect on water quality. When you  
18 keep the pool of the reservoir high, as high as you can, you  
19 result in a better quality of water for treatment. It  
20 requires less chemical, obviously it requires less electricity  
21 for pumping and moving the water and it results in a cleaner,  
22 better quality of water.

23 There is a term called trihelimethanes, THM, and  
24 essentially what causes them in water quality is when fine  
25 microscopic particles of sediment in water are not completely

1 removed and molecules of chlorine attach to them. It's  
2 becoming a problem and a concern for water systems, and the  
3 federal agencies like the EPA and others who are involved in  
4 water quality are urging water systems to reduce the levels of  
5 THM in drinking water. That's difficult to do when your water  
6 supply changes and fluctuates and sediment loads change  
7 because of the management of the system. We think GP 2021  
8 offers the best option for water quality in our part of the  
9 river.

10 Our intake structure is south of Mobridge about seven  
11 miles. We draw water out of Lake Oahe and the water quality  
12 is very good when the pool is high and especially in the  
13 summer it declines when that water level fluctuates. We would  
14 like to see a stable summer pool, not just for drinking water  
15 but also for recreation. The towns of Mobridge and Gettysburg  
16 and Pollock and others are seeing a developing recreational  
17 industry and it's successful when the fish are biting and it's  
18 not when they aren't. The years when the river was low and we  
19 saw mud flats along the Missouri River in the Mobridge area,  
20 tumbleweeds as large as Christmas trees rolled into the town  
21 of Mobridge. It's hard to sell recreation when you have that  
22 kind of impact. So low flow has a very dramatic effect on  
23 water quality and it also has an effect on the economy and  
24 recreational base that we are trying to develop there.

25 We have sympathy certainly for those downstream who

1 are affected by the operations of reservoirs and the effect it  
2 has on farm lands, but much of the lands that were lost,  
3 almost four to 500,000 acres of land that was lost when the  
4 dams were built came from those counties and those areas that  
5 are in the area that we serve now along the Missouri River,  
6 Lake Oahe. So we have lost the land already and the benefits  
7 of irrigation were not feasible, did not work. We have other  
8 alternatives like rural water which we have utilized and  
9 developed, but recreation is the next opportunity we need and  
10 we would like to see.

11 In terms of cost, the WEB system extended its intake  
12 pipeline out into the Missouri River an additional 1,000 feet  
13 in order to accommodate the fluctuating flows in elevations in  
14 the early 1990s. That cost 1.3 million additional dollars to  
15 extend that intake. It gave us an additional 21 feet below  
16 the pool. The cost of moving water increased of course, it's  
17 going to increase as we lift it additional feet, but we had to  
18 guarantee our intake and our water quality source. That  
19 investment has been made.

20 When you look at the costs, the additional costs that  
21 result in changing or going from 2021 to some of the other  
22 alternatives, it's less than one percent and I would contend  
23 that the additional cost that municipalities and rural water  
24 systems will see in treatment of water because of sediment and  
25 turbidity would probably offset those differences, so I think

1 you should look very closely at the impact water quality has  
2 on drinking water, and it's more than just the municipalities  
3 that were drawing out of the river when the dams were built.  
4 Now we see rural water systems covering most of South Dakota.  
5 And most of them are drawing their water, the large ones are  
6 drawing their water from the Missouri River.

7 My father operated a blade and was a construction  
8 operator who helped build the Oahe reservoir near Pierre and  
9 he took great pride in that project and everything that it  
10 brought to the country and to South Dakota. But things have  
11 changed, a lot of things have changed in the 40 years that  
12 have passed. Dams were built by men and women and they can be  
13 changed and they need to be changed if they benefit, if we see  
14 a better benefit and a greater benefit for community. South  
15 Dakota made decisions and traded essentially irrigation for  
16 drinking water and now most of South Dakota is covered by  
17 drinking water systems that rely on the Missouri River. Water  
18 quality needs to be looked at closely and so does recreation  
19 that was part of that promise.

20 COLONEL DAVID FASTABEND: I need to advise you your  
21 time has expired. If you can go ahead and wrap up in one  
22 sentence, that would be fine.

23 CURT HOHN: In closing, we think the Corps of  
24 Engineers should look at the broader benefits of the river  
25 that are provided under GP2021. Thank you.

1 COLONEL DAVID FASTABEND: Thank you, Mr. Hohn.

2 RICHARD MOORE: Bill Beacom.

3 BILL BEACOM: My name is Bill Beacom and I am a  
4 navigator. It would seem that there is the need to make a  
5 decision, whether you look up the sprint man or maybe get a  
6 hat to cover up the scapegoat across my forehead because I  
7 have gotten blamed for everything that has happened on the  
8 Missouri River above Gavins Point for the last 14 years. Even  
9 Senator Daschle plays silly games with silly little plans that  
10 go against the Endangered Species Act. Below Gavins Point, we  
11 are told that we must encourage erosion and encourage more  
12 sediment so we can benefit the habitat of the fishes, but the  
13 Missouri River Restoration Act in South Dakota says that we  
14 must discourage erosion and discourage sediment because it  
15 costs us money, and South Dakota money is certainly more  
16 important than the downstream money.

17 I have heard nothing but blame placed on the  
18 navigators for the problems that South Dakota, North Dakota  
19 and Montana has caused for themselves. There is not anyone in  
20 South Dakota that would try to raise pheasants on a fox farm,  
21 but yet they have put every known fish predator into their  
22 water system that could possibly live in this area and they  
23 cannot figure out why 32 species of native fish are on the  
24 decline. My gosh, let's change the habitat, certainly we  
25 don't want to get rid of the foxes, they are making us money.

1 Blame it on somebody downstream. Now, you can't tell me that  
2 there is this many fisheries biologists that are unaware that  
3 of the hundred species that have gone down in the last -- of  
4 the 40 species that have gone down in the last hundred years,  
5 that 43 percent was caused by intentional introduction by U.S.  
6 Fish and Wildlife and only 38 percent was caused by habitat  
7 change. I mean, this is not a secret to anybody.

8           Why is it that everybody wants to avoid reality and  
9 wants to get somebody else to blame for what they have caused  
10 themselves? I don't understand this kind of approach.  
11 Navigation is struggling. You people built an \$87 million  
12 recreation industry under the current water control plan and  
13 yet you say it's not feasible. If you could build something  
14 from zero to 87 million, what do you want to do? Are you so  
15 greedy that you don't want any of the downstream states to  
16 have any part of it? Do you want to grow your recreation to  
17 any bounds possible at the expense of the lower states?

18           A gentleman come up here and talks about his water.  
19 The reason the water is hard to clean is because it's got  
20 sediment in it. If it's got sediment in it, it's got  
21 nutrients in it. Should we take all the nutrients out of the  
22 water so the small fish have nothing to eat? None of this  
23 makes any sense. It's nothing but a nonsensical approach to a  
24 problem that's not going to get solved until we start facing  
25 the reality and the reality is you got to take responsibility

1 for what you are doing and quit blaming it on everybody else.

2 COLONEL DAVID FASTABEND: Thank you, Mr. Beacom.

3 RICHARD MOORE: Tracie Weber.

4 TRACIE WEBER: Hi, my name is Tracie Weber and I am  
5 speaking on my own behalf as a concerned individual. I live  
6 in Sioux Falls, South Dakota today, but I grew up on a farm in  
7 southeast South Dakota near the James River and my father  
8 loved to take us to the Missouri River. We fished, we camped,  
9 we went boating, and we just went there to enjoy the river  
10 itself. I went on to obtain my biology degree from the  
11 University of South Dakota and I chose to stay here in South  
12 Dakota and work to protect our natural treasures.

13 Two hundred years ago Lewis and Clark traveled up the  
14 Missouri. The river that they encountered was much different  
15 than the river that we know today. We can't go back to the  
16 days of Lewis and Clark, but we can take this opportunity, the  
17 revision of the Master Manual, to try to restore as much as  
18 possible the natural flow regime of the river, therefore,  
19 restoring natural habitat and protecting threatened and  
20 endangered species. We need to support the recommendations by  
21 the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service for a spring rise and  
22 summer low flow, to assist in the recovery of the endangered  
23 species on the river by providing a semblance of the  
24 Missouri's historical, natural rise and fall of water levels.  
25 This will, as you know, increase the frequency of water levels

1     that cue fish spawning, increase sandbar habitat for birds and  
2     other species, increase shallow water habitat for native  
3     fishes, and increase fishing, canoeing, hunting and other  
4     forms of recreation and all the benefits that they bring to  
5     local economies.

6             We must also support the U.S. Fish and Wildlife  
7     Service recommendations for restoration of river and  
8     floodplain habitat, for unbalancing of the three main  
9     reservoirs, for adaptive management of the river system, and  
10    for biological monitoring of the river system.

11            The Missouri belongs to us all and it needs to be  
12    managed with that in mind. For too long it has been  
13    controlled by the needs of a single industry, navigation,  
14    which continues to provide very little economic benefit for  
15    the Missouri River basin. It's time for the Corps of  
16    Engineers to listen to biologists and fish and wildlife  
17    experts who know how to protect vulnerable plant, fish and  
18    wildlife species and the habitat and water conditions they  
19    need to survive. I urge you to adopt the GP2021 alternatives  
20    and I thank you for the opportunity to speak this evening.

21            COLONEL DAVID FASTABEND: Thank you, Ms. Weber.

22            RICHARD MOORE: Peter Carrels.

23            PETER CARRELS: Thank you for the opportunity to  
24    present testimony. My name is Peter Carrels, I live in  
25    Aberdeen, South Dakota. I work for the organization American

1 Rivers, but this testimony is not presented on their behalf.

2           Dissatisfaction with the status quo and a widespread  
3 and growing desire to continue the process of healing the  
4 Missouri River is why the Master Manual is being reviewed.  
5 This is why the Corps of Engineers has worked for more than a  
6 decade to resolve issues related to updating and reforming  
7 management of the river's mainstem dams.

8           I endorse the Fish and Wildlife Service's biological  
9 opinion and encourage the Corps of Engineers to adopt  
10 alternative GP2021.

11           No fair-minded individual, organization or unit of  
12 government can deny that circumstances have changed on the  
13 Missouri River during the past 50 years. These changes have  
14 rendered current dam management techniques, the status quo, if  
15 you will, out of date, inadequate, and inappropriate.

16           Consider recent history to understand such changes.  
17 South and North Dakotans were enticed to approve five major  
18 dams on the Missouri River because of the large irrigation  
19 projects that were promised to these states by the federal  
20 government. The economic impact associated with the loss of  
21 hundreds of thousands of acres inundated behind the dams was  
22 to have been replaced by these large irrigation projects. But  
23 the federal government and the promoters of these irrigation  
24 projects did not understand the full spectrum of critical  
25 issues regarding such irrigation on the Northern Plains. They

1 did not correctly understand the long-term irrigability of the  
2 soils they proposed to irrigate. Ultimately, large federal  
3 irrigation projects in the region were not built.

4 But the dams were built and the large reservoirs  
5 behind them filled, and some of the most biologically  
6 productive land and water environments in the plains were  
7 destroyed.

8 Not only did federal planners fall short in their  
9 understanding of the irrigation in the Dakotas, they also  
10 failed to correctly project the suitability and economics of  
11 the channelized Missouri River for navigation. For several  
12 key reasons, the commercial navigation industry on the  
13 Missouri has never matched expectations. Commercial cargo  
14 shipped on the river is scant, and independent economists have  
15 proved this is an inefficient enterprise. But navigation  
16 supporters keep inventing arcane gimmicks to support the  
17 viability of the industry, and river and dam management  
18 continues to place high priority on waterborne shipping.

19 Times have changed and so have priorities. South  
20 Dakotans recognized the need to shift their expectations from  
21 the river. Irrigation was replaced by domestic water  
22 pipelines. When Pick-Sloan was passed, no one anticipated  
23 that domestic water pipelines would one day utilize water from  
24 the Missouri. Also unanticipated was the recreation industry  
25 that developed along the large impoundments behind the

1    mainstem dams.

2               Reservoirs bring their own set of complicated issues,  
3    but recreation and wildlife have become a new focus not only  
4    in the upper basin but in the lower basin as well, where many  
5    residents point to lost oxbow lakes and wildlife habitat and  
6    the need to restore the river's former ecology.

7               Supporters of the status quo, particularly the state  
8    of Missouri, warn of large, out of basin water transfers from  
9    the reservoirs. These worries are largely baseless. Where is  
10   solid evidence that plans for out of basin transfers are in  
11   the works? There is criticism of efforts to protect  
12   endangered species. But the upshot of protecting endangered  
13   species is to protect countless other species of wildlife.  
14   Floodplain farmers in the lower basin contend that a spring  
15   rise will destroy their lands. That's not what the research  
16   modeling indicates.

17              The current management approach was motivated and  
18   compelled by the inaccuracies and exaggerated projections.  
19   What if we knew 50 years ago that Missouri River navigation  
20   and irrigation would never materialize? What if we had  
21   anticipated the desire of so many Americans to hunt, fish,  
22   camp, hike, paddle or bird watch along the Missouri River?  
23   How would that have changed our approach?

24              Fifty years ago, the people of the Missouri River  
25   region were fighting against the river. Today they are

1 fighting against each other. Neither approach, we have  
2 learned, is as economically and environmentally productive and  
3 useful as learning to coexist with rivers.

4 In 1952, Time Magazine called the Missouri River the  
5 most useless river there is. That was a different era, a less  
6 informed era, an era filled with mistakes about managing  
7 natural resources. Today, people want more from their rivers  
8 than just industrial trenches or holding ponds behind dams.  
9 The Corps of Engineers can take an important step in righting  
10 past mistakes on the Missouri River by adopting dam management  
11 techniques that are friendlier to the river. Do we want to  
12 continue to kill the Missouri River, or do we want to take  
13 real steps that will help heal it? Thank you.

14 COLONEL DAVID FASTABEND: Thank you, Mr. Carrels. We  
15 have gone through our list of cards. Is there anyone here  
16 tonight that would like to make a statement? In closing,  
17 then, I would like to remind you that the hearing  
18 administrative record will be open through 28 February 2002  
19 for anyone wishing to submit written facts or electronic  
20 comments. Also, if you want to be on our mailing list or  
21 receive a copy of the transcript, you need to fill out one of  
22 the cards available at the table by the entrance. If there  
23 are no further comments, this hearing session is closed.  
24 Ladies and gentlemen, I thank you for being here tonight and  
25 providing us with some very valuable information. Thank you

1     very much.

2             (Whereupon, the proceedings were concluded at 8:30  
3     p.m.)

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

## 1 C E R T I F I C A T E

2

3 STATE OF SOUTH DAKOTA )  
4 ) ss.  
5 COUNTY OF HUGHES )

6

7 I, Carla A. Bachand, RPR, CM, Freelance Court  
8 Reporter for the State of South Dakota, residing in Pierre,  
9 South Dakota, do hereby certify:

10 That I was duly authorized to and did report the  
11 testimony and evidence in the above-entitled cause;

12 I further certify that the foregoing pages of this  
13 transcript represents a true and accurate transcription of my  
14 stenotype notes.

15

16 IN WITNESS WHEREOF, I have hereunto set my hand on  
17 this the 5th day of November, 2001.

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

\_\_\_\_\_  
Carla A. Bachand, RPR, CM  
Freelance Court Reporter  
Notary Public, State of South Dakota  
Residing in Pierre, South Dakota.

My commission expires: June 10, 2006.